



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,896	08/02/2000	Timothy J. Moulsey	1999P00481 US	7981
24737	7590	11/08/2011	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			GREY, CHRISTOPHER P	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2474	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/08/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com  
debbie.henn@philips.com  
marianne.fox@philips.com

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/630,896	MOULSLEY ET AL.
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER GREY	Art Unit 2474

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) CHRISTOPHER GREY. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.  
 (2) Dicran Halajian. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 November 2011.

Type:  Telephonic  Video Conference  
 Personal [copy given to:  applicant  applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed  101  112  102  103  Others

(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Claim 1 was discussed with respect to the applicants proposed amendments, which the examiner agreed overcomes the combination of references previously applied. Particularly the applicant proposed deleting the phrase "could be made" and replacing it with "is available".

**Applicant recordation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

Attachment

/Christopher P Grey/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2474	
---	--